

TASK ORDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION FORM**GREAT LAKES NATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE
ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACT**

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Contract | EP-R5-11-09 | TO Number | 68HE0518F0667 |
| Evaluator Name | Mary Beth Giancarlo | Date Reviewed | 6/15/2020 |
| 1. Understanding of the requirement and proposed technical approach | | | |
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable |
| Contractor demonstrates an understanding of the requirement by identifying additional information that is needed to deliver a complete remedial design package and by creating a new Time & Materials task as directed in the scope to cover currently unknown technical support activities that may come up over the life of the project. The contractor proposes a sound technical approach as an additional treatability study is critical to the development of the remedial design for both the sediment remediation and construction of the containment area. | | | |
| 2. Rate the reasonableness of the Contractor's proposed Milestone and Deliverables table | | | |
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable |
| An updated milestone and deliverables table was not requested, or necessary, as part of Amendment 3. | | | |
| 3. Management approach and relevance of proposed personnel | | | |
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable |
| There is no change in personnel proposed as part of Amendment 3, which is acceptable as no new disciplines are being proposed. | | | |
| OVERALL TECHNICAL RATING | | | |
| <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> | Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable |

TECHNICAL EVALUATION DOCUMENT INSTRUCTIONS

TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The document allows for you to select a pass or fail rating and write a description explaining that rating for each evaluation factor identified in the request for offeror. After rating each individual factor, the document allows you to give an Overall Technical Rating for the technical proposal. The document may be used to create a draft or final evaluation, and may be used as either an individual or consensus evaluation. You may modify the document to add rows for additional factors.

Note: The Contracting Office is the source selection authority.

RATINGS

| Rating | Definition |
|---------------------|---|
| Acceptable | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria• Contains no significant weaknesses or deficiencies and contains minor to low weaknesses and/or deficiencies that can be corrected• Low risk |
| Unacceptable | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fails to meet one or more or most of the minimum requirements of the criteria• Contains several or major weaknesses and/or deficiencies that would require a large amount of correction to be made satisfactory• Low or very low probability of success• High risk or very high risk |